

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

DOROTHY V. MCADAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

LAS VEGAS BOAT HARBOR, INC.;
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE; and DOES
EMPLOYEES I through X; DOES I through
X, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:12-cv-01534-MMD-VCF

ORDER

(Counter-Motion to Remand – dkt. no. 7)

This is a personal injury and premises liability action. Plaintiff asserts that Defendant Las Vegas Boat Harbor, Inc. owns, controls, and is responsible for the electrical cables Plaintiff tripped over while at the Lake Mead National Recreation Area. (Dkt. no. 20 at 3.)

The Court previously granted the United States of America's Motion to Dismiss. (Dkt. no. 14.) Because Plaintiff is no longer suing the government and her Complaint alleges only state law causes of action (dkt. no. 1-1), Plaintiff now moves to remand this case to the Eighth Judicial District for Clark County, Nevada,¹ as her remaining claims


¹ Plaintiff stipulated to the United States' dismissal in her Counter-Motion, arguing that the United States should be dismissed and the case should be remanded. Plaintiff also filed a renewed Motion to Remand after the Court dismissed Defendant United States. (Dkt. no. 18.)

1 do not exceed the \$75,000 amount-in-controversy requirement.² 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a).
2 Defendant Las Vegas Boat Harbor, Inc. does not contest that Plaintiff seeks less than
3 \$75,000 in damages. (Dkt. no. 19.)

4 Accordingly, Plaintiff's Counter-Motion to Remand (dkt. no. 7) is GRANTED. This
5 case is REMANDED back to the Eighth Judicial District Court.

6 The Clerk of the Court is ordered to close the case.

7
8 ENTERED THIS 5th day of December 2012.

9
10 
11 _____
12 MIRANDA M. DU
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 ²In fact, before Defendant United States was joined, this case had previously
28 been remanded to state court for failure to meet the amount in controversy requirement.
(Dkt. no. 18-2.)